Dear Mr. Judson,

I am enclosing a copy of a poem which I have written in connection with the present world crisis and the duty of America with regard to it.

It has met with Ex-President Taft's hearty approval and he writes that he has sent it to the Secretary of the League to Enforce Peace.

Dr. Murray Butler of Columbia University not only approves of it but writes me he will have it preserved in the University Library.

It is also to be sung this week in Richmond, Va. at a conference of the Interchurch World Movement.

I think that you will agree with me that it is time the great leaders of thought and of moral and spiritual influence throughout the country were meeting together in conference with regard to the world situation, which seems to have been brought by Providence to a focus to this country.

It is unthinkable that our great national leaders should outside of politics allow the destinies of not only this nation but of the world to be determined by the politicians, especially as their principal aim seems to be to manoeuvre for commanding positions for the election next year.

It is really like playing politics on the Day of Judgment, and this is none other than a Day of Judgment for all nations.

Ivy Depot, Va.
Dec. 5, 1919
Dear Mr. Johnson,

I am writing to inquire about a book which I have written. In connection with the present war effort, I am阁 to

It is not within my power to provide a copy of the book. I am阁 to the receipt of the letter

I am阁 to the receipt of your letter of 30th September, 1939. I am阁 to the receipt of your letter.

I am阁 to the receipt of your letter of 30th September, 1939. I am阁 to the receipt of your letter.
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I am阁 to the receipt of your letter of 30th September, 1939. I am阁 to the receipt of your letter.

I am阁 to the receipt of your letter of 30th September, 1939. I am阁 to the receipt of your letter.

I am阁 to the receipt of your letter of 30th September, 1939. I am阁 to the receipt of your letter.

I am阁 to the receipt of your letter of 30th September, 1939. I am阁 to the receipt of your letter.

I am阁 to the receipt of your letter of 30th September, 1939. I am阁 to the receipt of your letter.

I am阁 to the receipt of your letter of 30th September, 1939. I am阁 to the receipt of your letter.

I am阁 to the receipt of your letter of 30th September, 1939. I am阁 to the receipt of your letter.

I am阁 to the receipt of your letter of 30th September, 1939. I am阁 to the receipt of your letter.

I am阁 to the receipt of your letter of 30th September, 1939. I am阁 to the receipt of your letter.

I am阁 to the receipt of your letter of 30th September, 1939. I am阁 to the receipt of your letter.

I am阁 to the receipt of your letter of 30th September, 1939. I am阁 to the receipt of your letter.

I am阁 to the receipt of your letter of 30th September, 1939. I am阁 to the receipt of your letter.

I am阁 to the receipt of your letter of 30th September, 1939. I am阁 to the receipt of your letter.

I am阁 to the receipt of your letter of 30th September, 1939. I am阁 to the receipt of your letter.

I am阁 to the receipt of your letter of 30th September, 1939. I am阁 to the receipt of your letter.

I am阁 to the receipt of your letter of 30th September, 1939. I am阁 to the receipt of your letter.

I am阁 to the receipt of your letter of 30th September, 1939. I am阁 to the receipt of your letter.

I am阁 to the receipt of your letter of 30th September, 1939. I am阁 to the receipt of your letter.

I am阁 to the receipt of your letter of 30th September, 1939. I am阁 to the receipt of your letter.
Self interest is disintegrating our national life and is the principal cause of social unrest. We were lifted up above it in a great measure during the war and the poor distracted people saw a vision of a young giant coming to their rescue. Is that vision to pass away and another take its place - of a man standing on a river bank watching a woman drown and not attempting a rescue for fear of ruining his clothes?

The Olympic pose of the Senate would be amusing if it were not so tragic. They are up against the situation which really requires an Isaiah or Ezekiel to comprehend and they think they know it all. They should be on their knees in fear and trembling in this Day of the Almighty lest the word Tekel be seen inscribed in letters of fire upon the wall.

Can't you and the other leaders of thought and influence get together and utter a trumpet call to the nation and not allow the higher interests of this nation and of the whole world to be mishandled by the politicians?

With all good wishes. I remain,

Yours faithfully,

Frederick W. Neve
The Call To America
Leader of Nations called to be
By peoples scattered far and wide,
Trusted by all to set them free,
Thou canst not put the call aside.

2
Moses thou art to them and they
Do look to thee with rod in hand
To lead them on their desert way
And bring them to the Promised Land.

3
Parched with the burning desert thirst,
Wounded with many a serpent's bite,
By many an ancient wrong accurst,
They look to thee to lead them right.

4
Thou hast already struck the blow
Which loosed the cruel Egyptian chains,
And wilt thou not still further go,
And do the work which still remains!

5
The Red Sea stained with ruddy glow -
Blood of thy sons - is safely crost,
And must they back to bondage go,
And all the agony be lost!

6
Leader of Nations! Strong and free!
We know full well where thou dost stand,
Thou wilt the peoples' Moses be,
And lead them to the Promised Land!

Frederick W. Neve
The Call to America

Theodore Roosevelt in his book, "The Winning of the West," discusses the importance of the call to America.

To those who call to the land of opportunity, the call to America means a chance to build, to create, to fulfill one's dreams.

This is a call to those who are willing to work hard and make sacrifices. It is a call to those who are prepared to take risks and pursue their visions.

The call to America is a call to greatness, a call to exceptionalism. It is a call to those who are not afraid to dream big and reach for the stars.

And so, the call to America is not just a call to those who are already here. It is a call to those who are yet to come, to those who are ready to make America great again.

Theodore Roosevelt

 Appendix A: Memo
December 13, 1919

Dear Mr. Neve:

Your favor of the 8th was received during my absence from the city. I thank you for the enclosure. While I am disturbed at the actual situation on the matter of the Treaty, still I am confident that after all it will be ratified in some form this winter. I cannot believe that the present state of chaos can be continued.

Very truly yours,

Mr. Frederick W. Neve,
Ivy Depot, Virginia.
December 13, 1918

Dear Mr. Hayes:

Your letter of the 8th was received and mine

expressions from the city. I thank you for the encourage-

while I am grateful of the necessary situation on

the matter of the teacher, until I am notified

that another will fill the position to some extent

which I cannot believe that the present teach-

er can be continued.

Very truly yours,

Mr. Secretary Hayes

L.A. Pierce, Principal.
November 28, 1919

Dear Mr. Phillips:

Under date of November 3rd you were kind enough to write that you were sending me a copy of the treaty of Versailles. The copy has never come and I am wondering whether perhaps your secretary may have overlooked it.

With sincere regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

Honorable William Phillips,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.
December 5th, 1919

Dear Mr. Phillips,

Under date of November 15th, you were kind enough to write that you were sending me a copy of the speech of Senator. The copy has never come and I am wondering whether perhaps your secretarial may have overlooked it.

With sincere regards,

Very truly yours,

Washington, D.C.

Homesteader, William Phillips
Department of Peace
Shall the Treaty of Peace Be One of Justice or One of Infamy?

AN APPEAL

to

The Members of the Senate of the United States

by

Major Louis Livingston Seaman, M.D., L.L.D., F.R.G.S.
President, Emeritus of The China Society of America

"The good old rule, the simple plan,
That they should take who have the power,
And they should keep who can."

NEW YORK, JULY 29, 1919.
An Appeal to the Members of the Senate of the United States.

Shall the Treaty of Peace Be One of Justice, or One of Infamy?

That is the question the United States is now called upon to consider, and the destiny of Nations hangs on the decision. America entered the great war as the champion of smaller nations—to preserve the independence of imperiled countries, and to rescue civilization from barbarism. From its birth our Republic has stood for the rights of the oppressed. Our ideals have been for Liberty and Justice. Our great civil conflict removed the blot of slavery from our land—our Spanish Campaign gave freedom and prosperity and happiness to an enslaved people in Cuba and in the Philippines, and our compensation for the sacrifice was the gratification of our ideals. We acknowledged no masters, and we do not propose to.

The problem today is the ratification of the Peace Treaty with the Huns and the creation of a League of Nations. Shall the Fourth of July, 1919, pass into history as the last anniversary of American independence? Shall we, by agreeing to Article 10 of the covenant of the League of Nations surrender our sovereignty gained in 1776, to Great Britain, who by a vote of six to one, can impose upon us the incalculable obligation of preserving the territorial integrity and political independence of herself or any member of the League of Nations in any part of the globe? Are we prepared to submit our traditional attitude regarding purely American questions to a tribunal in which we are in such a hopeless minority or in which the vote of New Zealand could count as equal to
our own? Shades of Washington and Jefferson! What would be their verdict if they could witness the depths to which our land has been dragged in order to gratify the personal ambition and egotism of the “too proud to fight” pacifist who in the Peace Conference at Paris has been so hopelessly outwitted by trained European and Oriental diplomacy that today he is the laughing stock of European statesmen, and whose refusal to prepare for the inevitable, resulted in a prolongation of the war for more than a year, the loss of more than a million lives, the destruction of property inestimable, and suffering and misery that cannot be described or measured. And poor China—whose Government, in the opinion of many competent authorities, has given more happiness and individual liberty to a greater mass of humanity than any other Government in the world—whose representatives were promised by our President that if their country entered the war in 1917 their territorial integrity would be preserved—where will China stand if this unholy alliance is consummated, and Shantung—the birthplace of Confucius, sacred to the Chinese—with its forty million inhabitants turned over to the tender mercy of the Japanese whose policy of territorial aggrandizement rivals that of the European nations, as witnessed in Korea, Manchuria and the Pacific Isles, and whose threats of aggression, made at the point of the bayonet, prevented China’s entrance in the war in its earliest days?

In August, 1914, I cabled Wu Ting Fang, Secretary of State of China, from Ostend, Belgium imploring China to sever diplomatic relations and declare war on Germany at once—to immediately seize all territory in China then occupied by Germany, to refuse further payment of indemnity for the Boxer uprising, and to demand repayment of all indemnities already paid, together with substantial damages for German occupation of Chinese territory. All this I then regarded, and still regard, as
the moral right of China, for there would have been no Boxer uprising had it not been for Germany’s policy of barbarism and aggression, when in carrying out the Kaiser’s order “to behave like Huns,” they committed acts of “Kultur” and cruelty that challenged those since perpetrated in Belgium and Poland. Now is China’s opportunity to regain her lost provinces and obtain justice, and the people of the United States who are familiar with the conditions and know the truth demand that the United States Senate shall secure this result.

It was hoped that the carnival of territorial lust, which for centuries caused untold bloodshed the world over, had culminated in the partitioning of Africa—the last of the continents to be parcelled off by the world’s looters, who in the division of the spoils, followed, as the robber barons of feudal days,

“The good old rule, the simple plan,
That they should take who have the power,
And they should keep who can.”

But look at China today—that grand old country, with its great wall which for over twenty centuries protected it from the hordes of Tartars and Mongols on the north, while its Thibetan ranges on the west, and impenetrable forests on the south, permitted it to live in peace and tranquillity thousands of years, with no fear of molestation by “foreign devils,” from land or sea. And in this time the beautiful but fallacious philosophy of Confucius, which taught the rule of moral suasion rather than that by might, grew until its essence was expressed in the proverb, “Better have no child than one who is a soldier”—this, too, in a land where it is considered a disgrace to die childless.

And what was the natural result of this pacifism? A condition of insecurity, of defenselessness, of inability to enforce that first law of nature—self-protection—fol-
lowed, which when realized by the Occidental nations, resulted in their seizing great sections of her domains upon trivial excuses, and wringing most valuable concessions from her rulers.

As a direct result of this spoliation, the worm at last turned, and the Boxer uprising of 1900 followed, having for its declared purpose the forcible expulsion of all foreigners from the country, and the recovery by China of her despoiled possessions. I say, without fear of contradiction by those who are familiar with that issue (and I was there), that that uprising was one of the most splendid exhibitions of patriotism witnessed in modern times. The methods pursued by the Chinese, due to the ignorance of their misguided leaders, and the horrors that followed, have afforded the theme for many a tragic tale and numberless explanatory theories. But the plain fact cannot be gainsaid, nor too strongly emphasized, that the essential motive of that propaganda was the freeing of the land from the hated foreigners, who, in current phrase, had “robbed the people of their country.”

It was then, that in reprisal and revenge, the so-called civilized world turned against them. The eight allied armies of the “great powers” marched to their capital, slaughtered their people, raped their women, looted their temples, their treasure and their habitations, committed brutalities that rivaled those of the Huns in the recent great tragedy, and created a sentiment in China which fairly crucified Christianity, and which should redound to the shame and humiliation of the Christian nations whose forces participated in the outrages; but which, instead, secured monstrous indemnities and subjected China to the most humiliating terms of peace that were ever inflicted upon a nation, and that have kept her poverty-stricken ever since. America, however, has some reason for pride in that she waived claims to over half the indemnity, whilst her great statesman, John Hay, succeeded temporarily in preserving the integrity of the country by his splendid policy of the “open door.”
Never shall I forget that winter at Ching Wan Tao, following the war, where detachments of the allied army were gathered awaiting the fate of China. They reminded me of a pack of hungry wolves around the carcass of a dead animal—each fearing to set his fangs in the carcass, lest while so engaged his neighbor might do the same with him. And so during the long negotiations that finally led to the declaration of peace, the situation continued.

Four years later I again visited that scene, and there, in smaller numbers, were found the troops of many nations still waiting, ready to seize the first opportunity to partition the country and to secure their share of the spoil. But more pressing engagements were then imminent, involving the attention of some of the powers. The Russo-Japanese struggle was on, and China was given a temporary respite. From that time until the outbreak of the revolution which led to the establishment of the Republic, China paid the indemnity claims with such regularity that no opportunity was found for interference.

For more than three-quarters of a century, beginning with the unrighteous Opium War, and even later, China has been subjected to a series of squeezes and despoilment of her territory to an extent unequalled in history. The iniquitous indemnities wrung from her as the result of the Boxer campaign would have been reversed, and the countries now receiving them would be paying for the outrages committed, had right, instead of might, prevailed. The powerful governments and financial institutions doing business in the Orient have become obsessed with the idea that it is legitimate business to “squeeze” the country, regardless of right or justice, and in transferring the so-called German rights in Shantung to Japan the Big Three are today continuing that policy—and making our country, the United States, underwriters to the unholy deal.
The effect upon China of the spoliation of her territory and finances created among the leading minds of her people an appreciation of her weakness, and of the necessity for the adoption of Occidental methods for self-protection. They saw the absolute imbecility of continuing the policy of the Manchu dynasty, and the necessity for a change of government and the Chinese Republic became a reality. The character of the revolution which made it possible was remarkable. It obtained the maximum of liberty with the minimum of bloodshed. It was an evolution rather than a revolution, the most potent factors of which were those of peace, and not of war. They were the results of trade with foreign nations, the importation of modern inventions, railroads, telegraphs, newspapers; the work of Christian missionaries, schools and colleges established by them; but, most of all, the influence of Chinese students who had been educated in foreign universities, and who carried back to their native land the high ideals of Occidental government. In comparison with the epoch-making wars for freedom in Occidental lands—the French revolution, England's fight for Magna Charta, or our own great seven years' struggle for independence—the Chinese revolution was almost bloodless. It is stated that the total mortality of the war which secured the emancipation of 400,000,000 of people, was less than the number lost in the Battle of the Wilderness, or in single conflicts in the war just concluded.

The moderation shown by the successful leaders to their late rulers, was another striking characteristic. Instead of the guillotine or exile, they were retired with liberal pensions, and allowed to retain their empty titles. The leaders enjoined upon their followers the protection of life and property, both commercial and missionary, and these orders were strictly obeyed.

A people who carried to a successful termination such a revolution, deserve the respect and recognition of the
world in their present great crisis. The enemies and loot­ers of China today forget the traditions of the race—that China was old when Chaldea and Babylon were young, that she saw the rise and fall of Grecian and Roman civilization, and that she has maintained the integrity and honor of her government ever since; that her scholars discovered the compass and invented the intellectual game of chess, when the Huns of Europe and the Japanese were groveling in the darkness of mediaevalism; that she produced her own science, literature, art, philosophy and religion, whose founder, Confucius, five hundred years before the birth of Christ, expounded the doc­trine of Christianity in the saying: "Do not do unto others what you would not have others do unto you." They forget that for nearly a thousand years China has been nearer a democracy in many features of its govern­ment than any other government then in existence. The fundamental unit of democracy, the foundation upon which our own government rests, is embodied in the principle of the New England town meeting. All author­ities on democracy, De Tocqueville, Bryce and the Compte de Paris, agree in this and in China all local gov­ernment for centuries has been controlled by local author­ities.

The Chinese have never sought territorial aggran­dizement, but have loved the paths of peace where the law of moral suasion, and not of might, ruled. They pos­sess qualities of industry, economy, temperance and tranquillity, unsurpassed by any nation on earth. With these qualities they are in the great race of the survival of the fittest to stay. They are to be feared by foreign nations more for their virtues than for their vices; and in their present struggle for the maintenance of their ter­ritory, they deserve our earnest sympathy and support. Will America, the champion of justice, now desert that grand old country and witness its vivisection when we have the power to prevent it?
The Japanese claim their country is overcrowded and they require more room for their increasing population. Is this a legitimate reason that the 450 million Chinese should be crowded out of the land in which they have lived for 6,000 years? Is China to become a second Honolulu where 60% of the population are Japanese?

Japan has already been rewarded many times for her contribution to the victory of the allies in being relieved of the threatening danger from Germany which, when in possession of Kauo Chau, strategically commanded the Japanese Sea, and where a strong navy would be a perpetual menace; and also, by the award of the rich islands north of the Equator, which seem to be forgotten when this subject is discussed.

Dr. David Jayne Hill our former ambassador to Germany stated in the North American Review that the Senate “can ratify the Treaty of Peace and at the same time can reject a compact for the League of Nations.” We hope the Senate will exercise its Constitutional right and defeat the creation of any League which is founded upon such monstrous injustice to a land which so richly deserves our protection, but which Mr. Wilson, who recognized it as a Republic, has deserted.

Defeated and made the laughing stock by the diplomacy of Lloyd George and the Japanese who, to use the language of the street, “put it all over him” while I was in Paris in the last days of the Peace Congress through the bluff of recognizing no color distinctions in the League of Nations—Wilson after urging the participation of China in the war, deliberately reversed his position—granted rights that never existed to Japan and, to save his face, now seeks to have his action endorsed by the American people. Was such a travesty of injustice ever attempted before and does he think he can “fool all the American people all of the time,” including the United States Senate?

The covenant of the League of Nations is presumed to be based upon equity. When I studied law, the first
axiom in that court was, "He who comes into equity must come with clean hands." Does Japan after her treatment of Korea and her secret treaties won by bribes and threats, come into this court with clean hands? Germany had no more rights in Shantung than a robber, who forcibly enters a house at night and whose expulsion could not be enforced by its owner. I was in Shantung at the time these so-called rights were claimed and the whole world knows how baseless they are. It also knows how much value the hypocritical Hun places on a so-called "missionary." And now Japan for the insignificant part she played in the war, where her entire mortality amounted to about 800, demands these so-called rights of Germany and many others as her share of the swag. And she further demands the stamp of approval of the Peace Commission and League of Nations. And America's self-appointed representative, Mr. Wilson, and his rubber stamp associates approve these demands. What would Lincoln and Burlingame and Hay, who won the respect and confidence of China through honest treatment and the establishment of the policy of the "Open Door" say if they were here! Would they not with one voice damn a document, whose initial act was of such monstrous injustice and will the United States Senate do less?

China's contribution to the victory of the Allies was far greater than that of Japan. With 100,000 men in the trenches in Belgium and France (and I was there and saw many who will never return), and another 100,000 in the munition plants of England, China did her part in defeating the Hun. She did this at the instigation of the United States; and unless something is done to disassociate our name from the proposed Shantung settlement of the Peace Treaty, the Chinese people for generations to come, will regard America and Americans with suspicion and contempt.

If the whole structure, erected for safeguarding the peace of the world, and preventing a "breaking of its
heart," depends on the rape of a nation of 400,000,000 innocent souls who trust to the honor of America for justice, then let the structure undergo reconstruction, or let America refuse to be a party to such a crime. A structure, founded upon treachery or injustice is not one to receive the endorsement of a nation whose inheritance of freedom was bequeathed as a rich legacy by a once hardy, brave and patriotic, but now lamented and departed race of ancestors, and whose duty it is to transmit it to coming generations "unprofaned and undecayed by the lapse of time."

And just here it might be pertinent to ask who requested Japan's assistance, or intervention in driving the Huns out of Kiao Chau? Did China? Oh, no! Japan began hostilities when China was not at war with Germany. She landed her troops more than a hundred miles north of Tsing Tao, and marched them through Chinese territory, subsisting them largely on the country through which they passed (thus committing what is usually called a trespass) and with the assistance of the British and Chinese, the 4,000 Germans were defeated. But let it be distinctly understood, that with the British fleet blockading the harbor of Kiao Chau—the Chinese could have accomplished the same result without assistance from Japan or any other power.

In discussing the Shantung question, Professor Jeremiah W. Jenks, Research Professor of Government and Public Administration and Director of the Far Eastern Bureau says:

"In laying plans for the control of Shantung, Japan has been playing for a big prize, for the control of Kiao Chau and the railroads of Shantung practically means the control of the capital province of China, and of the chief normal shipping port for all of North China. The war gave her an excuse to seize Kiao Chau, which she did on November 6, 1914. Her next step in China was to present in January, 1915, a secret series of demands,
which if granted would in the near future enable Japan to dominate the policy of China from the military, financial and political viewpoints. The Japanese government at first falsely denied that such demands had been made, and when it saw it could not conceal the fact it gave out a list of "requests," suppressing altogether those that most endangered China's sovereignty. Under threat of war China acceded to all the demands but Group V, which would have made her a subject nation. Japan stated that Group V would be reserved for further consideration. From the time that Japan seized Kiaochau, she has treated Shantung as a conquered province, occupying the German buildings for military and administrative purposes, placed guards along the railway line to the capital, has assumed military control of property and has instituted civil government over the sections she occupies. Confirmation by the Big Three of Japan's claims to this territory, with the unwritten understanding that Japan shall eventually return it to China, has roused a storm of indignation among Chinese everywhere, and there are reports that the Chinese will resort to their most effective weapon, a boycott against all things Japanese," which, if not successful, may be followed by war.

Senator Borah stated the case admirably when he said, "The Shantung provision should come out of this treaty definitely and conclusively. It is no different in principle from the arrangement with reference to Alsace-Lorraine fifty years ago. It is in fact no different in principle from the dismemberment of Poland nearly 200 years ago. Both of these transactions planted the seeds of future wars, and both went far to impeach and destroy the moral prestige of all nations responsible for these crimes. The mark of Cain has been upon them ever since."

As already stated—the question the Senate has to determine is, whether it will endorse the decision of the
Peace Conference in the Shantung controversy and thereby make America an underwriter of that outrage? If it decides that the fictitious claims of Japan to the so-called German rights in Shantung shall be transferred from China to Japan, it will compound a felony, it will commit an act of perfidy unsurpassed in American history, and it will be an act of injustice to China that is destined to bring about another war in the near future in which the brutality and mortality are likely to far exceed the record of the great tragedy just ended. Instead of proving an instrument for the preservation of peace its first result is likely to provoke a just and righteous war. In case China should decide to fight for the retention of her rights, on which side will America—ordered by Lloyd George—array her armies? The Chinese have long memories. I well remember a conversation with His Excellency Li Hung Chang in his Yamen in Peking during the Boxer War, when we were discussing the danger from the prolonged presence of the allied armies in China. "Oh," he said, "they will not stay long." "Well," I replied, "the Manchus remained some time—nearly three hundred years." "What is 300 years in the life of China?" was his answer. And in that time the Manchus had been absorbed.

In the comparatively recent Ty Ping rebellion the mortality amounted to over 15 millions. If the military awakening of China occurs as a result of the wrongs to which it has been subjected by the Peace Commission the war that will follow and the mortality that will result will be without precedent.

Query.—As a starter for Perpetual Peace, is the United States prepared to assume this responsibility? And, is a League of Nations based on such a damnable, fraudulent and iniquitous foundation likely to serve as an inspiration for humanity and to bring about "Peace on earth and good will toward men?"
The following resolution was passed at a recent meeting of The American Defense Society:

Resolved, That the American Defense Society requests the Senate not to ratify those provisions in the Peace Treaty which convey to Japan the rights, interests and privileges heretofore held in the Province of Shantung by the Empire of Germany, and that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate of the United States.

MAJOR LOUIS LIVINGSTON SEAMAN,
M.D., L.L.D., F.R.G.S.

President, Emeritus of The China Society of America.

New York, July 29th, 1919.